

Tilburg University

## Constrained optimization in simulation

Kleijnen, Jack P.C.; van Beers, W.C.M.; van Nieuwenhuyse, I.

*Published in:*  
European Journal of Operational Research

*Publication date:*  
2010

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Kleijnen, J. P. C., van Beers, W. C. M., & van Nieuwenhuyse, I. (2010). Constrained optimization in simulation: A novel approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 202(1), 164-174.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221709003130>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Online appendix of "Constrained Optimization in Expensive Simulation: Novel Approach"

Jack P.C. Kleijnen a), Wim van Beers b) and Inneke van Nieuwenhuyse c)

a) *Department of Information Management, Tilburg University, Postbox 90153,  
5000 LE Tilburg, Netherlands, e-mail: kleijnen@uvt.nl,*

*http://center.uvt.nl/staff/kleijnen/; phone 31-13-466-2029; fax: 31-13-466-3069*

b) *Department of Information Management, Tilburg University, Postbox 90153,  
5000 LE Tilburg, Netherlands, e-mail: W.C.M.vanBeers@uvt.nl*

c) *Department of Decision Sciences and Information Management, K.U. Leuven,  
Leuven, Belgium, email : inneke.vannieuwenhuyse@econ.kuleuven.be*

Version: 22 April 2009

---

In this appendix we present computational results for the so-called "toy problem". We generate the outputs of this problem through second-order polynomials augmented with noise. This problem is based on (Angin et al., 2002). However, to increase the integer-valued search area, we transform the original decision variables  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  into  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  as follows:

$$z_1 = \frac{d_1}{10}, \quad z_2 = \frac{d_2}{10} - 2, \quad 0 \leq d_1 \leq 30, \quad 0 \leq d_2 \leq 30. \quad (1)$$

This gives the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & E(w_0) = E[5(\frac{d_1}{10} - 1)^2 + (\frac{d_2}{10} - 7)^2 + 4\frac{d_1}{10}(\frac{d_2}{10} - 2) + e_0] \\ \text{subject to} \quad & E(w_1) = E[(\frac{d_1}{10} - 3)^2 + (\frac{d_2}{10} - 2)^2 + \frac{d_1}{10}(\frac{d_2}{10} - 2) + e_1] \leq 4 \\ & E(w_2) = E[(\frac{d_1}{10})^2 + 3(\frac{d_2}{10} - 0.939)^2 + e_2] \leq 9 \\ & 0 \leq d_1 \leq 30, \quad 0 \leq d_2 \leq 30; \quad d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The random errors  $e_0$ ,  $e_1$ , and  $e_2$  are normally distributed with means 0, variances  $\sigma_{0,0} = 0.7500$  (so  $\sigma_0 = \sqrt{0.75} = 0.87$ ),  $\sigma_{1,1} = 0.0169$ ,  $\sigma_{2,2} = 0.1200$ , and correlations  $\rho_{0,1} = 0.82$ ,  $\rho_{0,2} = 0.30$ ,  $\rho_{1,2} = -0.07$ . Because the simulation noise is purely additive in this problem, we do not use CRN to sample the multivariate normal noise at different input combinations. It is easy to derive that the true optimum for this integer problem is (12, 24), with  $E(w_0) = 23.28$ ,  $E(w_1) = 3.88$ ,  $E(w_2) = 7.8436$ .

Table 1 shows the results of our heuristic for 10 macroreplicates. The number of replicates per point is either fixed at  $m_i = m = 110$  or determined by the relative precision requirement with  $\gamma = 0.15$ . This table also shows the OptQuest results for the same 10 macroreplicates with  $m_i = m = 110$ , starting from the initial solution  $(15, 15)$ .

ARENA Version 12 finds the optimum after only 9 points in each macroreplicate (we conjecture that OptQuest’s scatter search happens to select a point at  $2/5$  and  $4/5$  respectively, of each input’s domain; this point is actually optimal). Strangely enough, Version 11 gives very different results; it finds the optimum only in 2 of the 10 macroreplicates. Our heuristic finds the optimum after 12 to 30 points; our heuristic uses a pilot sample with 9 points, which explains why it needs more than 9 points to find the optimum.

Table 2 summarizes the performance results of the different heuristics, measured through the average, minimum, and maximum of the estimated goal and constraint values over the ten macroreplicates.

Table 1  
Results for the toy problem obtained by the heuristic

Macrorep.	Heuristic	$\mathbf{d}_{\text{opt}}$	$w_0$	$w_1$	$w_2$	$i_{\text{max}}$	Rank
1	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.31	3.89	7.82	105	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.504	NA	NA	105	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.31	3.89	7.82	105	12
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(11, 23)	22.64	3.93	6.72	56	14
2	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.41	3.89	7.85	103	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.41	NA	NA	103	90
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.41	3.89	7.85	103	13
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(13, 24)	22.83	3.44	7.97	62	30
3	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.34	3.89	7.85	93	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.34	NA	NA	93	90
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.34	3.89	7.85	93	15
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 24)	22.49	3.79	7.74	61	13
4	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.31	3.88	7.81	104	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.84	NA	NA	104	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.31	3.88	7.81	104	12
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 24)	23.05	3.82	7.86	60	12
5	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.28	3.89	7.79	105	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.67	NA	NA	105	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.28	3.89	7.79	105	13
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(11, 23)	22.67	3.93	6.95	47	18
6	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.22	3.87	7.81	71	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.65	NA	NA	71	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.22	3.87	7.81	71	12
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 24)	23.08	3.85	7.86	49	12
7	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.28	3.88	7.83	91	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.64	NA	NA	91	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.28	3.88	7.83	91	16
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 24)	23.21	3.86	7.66	63	15
8	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.29	3.88	7.84	98	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 25)	23.15	NA	NA	98	78
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(13, 25)	23.15	3.77	8.97	98	16
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 23)	23.22	3.65	6.96	56	17
9	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.27	3.87	7.89	75	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 24)	23.55	NA	NA	75	55
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.27	3.87	7.89	75	11
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(11, 23)	23.08	3.94	6.81	55	12
10	OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.20	3.86	7.82	98	9
	OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 110$	(13, 25)	23.33	NA	NA	98	78
	DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 110$	(12, 24)	23.20	3.86	7.82	98	11
	DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	(12, 24)	23.07	3.79	8.03	54	14

Table 2

Performance summary based on 10 macroreplicates for the toy problem

Heuristic	$w_0$			$w_1$			$w_2$		
	average	max	min	average	max	min	average	max	min
OptQuest (Arena 12) $m_i = 10$	23.29	23.41	23.20	3.88	3.89	3.86	7.83	7.89	7.79
OptQuest (Arena 11) $m_i = 10$	23.39	23.84	22.26	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
DOE-Kri-MP $m_i = 10$	23.28	23.41	23.15	3.87	3.89	3.77	7.94	8.97	7.79
DOE-Kri-MP $\gamma = 0.15$	22.93	23.22	22.49	3.80	3.94	3.44	7.46	8.03	6.72